# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/820,966 | 03/30/2001 | Lev Brouk | ODVFP009 | 3909 |

| | | | EXAMINER |
|---|---|---|---|
| 22434　　　7590　　04/16/2008 | | | TRUONG, LAN DAI T |
| BEYER WEAVER LLP | | | |
| P.O. BOX 70250 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250 | | 2152 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 04/16/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 09/820,966 | BROUK ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | LAN-DAI Thi TRUONG | 2152 | |

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 January 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**    2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-10 and 17-79</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-10 and 17-79</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/28/2008</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is response to communications: application, filed 03/30/2001; amendment filed on 01/28/2008; claims 1, 3-10 and 17-79 are pending; claims 1, 32, 51-52 and 63-64 are amended; claims 2 and 11-16 are canceled; claims 80-83 are withdrawn.

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 01/28/2008 have been fully considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Specification Objections

3. The specification is objected to under CRF 1.75; there is no definition for the phase "machine-readable medium" provided in the specification. In this instance, applicant failed to provide antecedent basic for the claim terminology "machine-readable medium." However, the context of the medium is used in the claim would fairly suggest to one of ordinary skill only appropriate manufactures those are structurally and functionally interconnected with the program in a manner which enables the program to act as a computer component and realize its functionality.

## Claim rejections-35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

**Claims 1, 3-10, 17-79 are rejected under 35 USC § 112 first paragraph as failing comply with written description requirements.**

### *Regarding claim 1:*

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter (e.g. routing scripts <u>selected from the group consisting</u> of routing script defined by a sending service, routing script defined by recipient service, and one or more routing scripts defined by one or more in-transit services), which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Nowhere in the specification discloses descriptive processes of selecting routing scripts from the group consisting of routing script defined by a sending service, routing script defined by recipient service, and one or more routing scripts defined by one or more in-transit services. Without disclosures processes of selecting routing script in the specification, how one of ordinary skill would be fairly suggested the sequences of claimed feature "determining routing path based on an evaluation of two or more routing scripts selected from group consisting of routing script defined by a sending service, routing script defined by recipient service, and one or more routing scripts defined by one or more in-transit services so that the evaluation used to determine route path during routing messages". The appropriate correction is requested.

### *Regarding claim 32, 51-52 and 63-64:*

Those claims are rejected under rationale of claim 1.

### *Regarding claim 3-10 and 17-31, 33-50, 53-62, 65-79:*

Those claims are depended on rejected claims 1, 32, 51-52 and 63-64, so they are also rejected under rationale of claim 1.

## Claim rejections-35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 17-25, 27-29, 31 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as**

**being un-patentable over Owens et al. (U.S. 6,633,630) in view of Johnson et al. (U.S.**

**6,665,393).**

*__Regarding claim 1:__*

Owens discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method, which can be

implemented in a computer hardware or software code for routing messages from one or more

sending services to one or more recipient services across a message interchange network,

comprising:

receiving a message from a sending service, said message including a header element and

at least one of: a body element including one or more documents that a sending service is

sending to a recipient service, and an attachment including one or more documents that a sending

service is sending to a recipient service: (Owens discloses an universal mailbox that implements

functions of an intermediary agent that supports for cross-media messaging between messages

senders and messages receivers. The universal mailbox implements steps of receiving in-bound

messages (e.g. email messages, fax messages…etc.) from the message senders and then sending

the in-bound messages to the messages receivers as out-bound messages: column 2, lines 35;

column 3, lines 4-59; abstract; figure 2; figure 3; figure 16).

delivering message to an in-transit service in said route path, wherein said in-transit

server performs an identifiable operation on said message as said message travels from a sending

service to an recipient service, the identifiable operation altering the content of the message to

ensure that the message has the proper format for recipient service: (the universal mailbox serves

as an access point for electronic messages communications (e.g. email, voice mail, fax...etc)

between the messages senders and the messages receivers. The processes of reformatting and

converting the electronic messages into appropriate format of receiver's system performed by the

universal mailbox: (Owens, column 2, lines 39-67; column 7, lines 34-47; column 8, lines 39-42

figure 1; figure 2; figure 3).

delivering of said message to said one or more recipient  service said route path

including one or more in-transit service: (the electronic messages may be sent through a third

party (e.g. the universal mailbox or communication server): Owens, figure 2; figure 3; column

15-47).

However, Owens does not explicitly disclose determining routing path for delivery; said

determining being based on an evaluation of two or more routing scripts selected from the group

consisting of: routing script defined by a sending service, routing script defined by recipient

service, and one or more routing scripts defined by one or more in-transit services, such that each

service is capable of independently affecting said determining of said route path during a logical

routing of said message represented by said evaluation.

In analogous art, Johnson discloses method of controlling call routing by executing routing scripts those are generated by the administration station and cooperated with customer-generated call routing scripts to determining and addressing desired destination for the call, see (abstract; column; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Johnson's ideas of evaluating routing scripts those defined by numbers of sources (e.g. administration station and customer) to determine desired destination for the call into Owens's system in order to increase flexibility messages routing system (e.g. modifiable routing scripts), see (Johnson, column 2, lines 49-61).

***Regarding claim 51:***

This claim is rejected under rationale of claim 1.

***Regarding claim 3:***

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Owens-Johnson further discloses header element is an extensible markup language header element: (Owens: figure 16).

***Regarding claims 4-7:***

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Owens-Johnson further discloses documents in body element and one or more documents can accommodate any type of data: (Owens: figure 16).

***Regarding claim 8:***

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Owens-Johnson further discloses message includes routing and route trace elements: (Owens: figure 16).

***Regarding claim 17:***

Owens-Johnson discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which includes recursively determining: (Johnson: abstract; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

### *Regarding claims 18-20:*

Owens-Johnson discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which includes determining occurs prior to physical delivery of message: (Johnson discloses method of determining and addressing desired destination for the call by executing routing scripts those are generated by the administration station and coporated with customer-generated call routing scripts. As one of ordinary skill in the art would know that path determining should be processed prior actual physical deliverying of message: abstract; column; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

### *Regarding claim 10:*

Owens-Johnson discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which includes receiving includes receiving said message from a party that sends said message on behalf of a sender (Owens: abstract).

### *Regarding claims 21-22:*

Owens-Johnson discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which includes a routing script defines a procedure based on pattern matching: (Johnson, abstract; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

### *Regarding claim 23-25:*

Owens-Johnson discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which includes routing scripts based on routing rules: (Johnson: column 5, lines 1-20).

### *Regarding claims 27-28 and 31:*

Those claims are rejected under rationale of claim 1.

### *Regarding claim 29:*

Owens-Johnson discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which includes delivering

message to said in-transit service for one of data transformation operation, an enrichment

operation, a cross-reference ID mapping operation, a filtering operation, and a credit scoring

operation: (Owens: abstract).

**Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Owens-**

**Johnson in view of Ghoneimy et al. (US 2004/0078373).**

### *Regarding claims 26:*

Owens-Johnson discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 25, but does

not explicitly teach conditions are combined using one or more of an AND, OR, XOR, and NOT

operator.

In analogous art, Ghoneimy discloses conditions are using is one or more of AND, OR,

XOR, and NOT operators , see ([0091]).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Ghoneimy's ideas of using one or more of AND, OR, XOR, and

NOT operators into Owens-Johnson's system in order to save development time and resources

by employ well-know technique (e.g. conditions of and, or, xor ....etc) into Owens-Johnson's

system.

**Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Owens-**

**Johnson in view of Koperda et al. (US 6,230,203).**

### *Regarding claim 30:*

Owens-Johnson discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim1, but does not explicitly comprising logging usage status and billing information after processing said message.

In analogous art, Koperda discloses method of billing customer based on usages status, see (abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Koperda's ideas of billing customer based on usages  into Owens-Johnson's system in order to increase benefits for both services providers and services consumers, see (Koperda: column 3, lines 14-25, lines 62-67).

**Claims 9, 32-47 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Owens et al. (U.S. 6,633,630) in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. 6,665,393) and further in view of Stewart et al. (U.S. 2002/0019797).**

*__Regarding claim 32:__*

Owens discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a system, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for routing messages from one or more sending services to one or more recipient services across a message interchange network, comprising:

message routing network enabling routing of messages between a sending services and one or more recipient services: (Owens discloses method of using an universal mailbox as intermediary agent which supports cross-media messaging between messages senders and messages receivers: column 2, lines 35; column 3, lines 4-59; abstract; figure 2; figure 3; figure 16).

a message routing network further enabling inclusion of a plurality of in-transit services
into said message routing network, wherein an in-transit service can be selectively including in a
routing for a message based upon an indefinable type of processing that said in-transit service
can perform on said message: (the universal mailbox serves as an access point for electronic
messages communications (e.g. email, voice mail, fax…etc) between the messages senders and
the messages receivers. The universal mailbox permits messages receiver to interacting with
different types of messages though a single device or mode, and to perform steps of reformatting
and converting the electronic messages into appropriate format of receiver's system: Owens,
column 2, lines 39-67; column 7, lines 34-47; column 8, lines 39-42 figure 1; figure 2; figure 3).

routing path defining delivery of message to one or more recipient of services, said route
path including one or more of the in-transit services: (the electronic messages may be sent
through one or more third party (e.g. the universal mailbox or communication server): Owens,
figure 2; figure 3; column 15-47).

However, Owens does not explicitly disclose route path determined based on an
evaluation of two or more routing scripts selected from the group consisting of a routing scripts
defined by defined by a sending service, a routing script defined by recipient service, and one or
more routing script defined by one or more in-transit services, such that each service is capable
of independently affecting said determining of said route path during a logical routing of said
message represented by said evaluation.

In analogous art, Johnson discloses method of controlling call routing by executing
routing scripts those are generated by the administration station and cooperated with customer-

generated call routing scripts to determining and addressing desired destination for the call, see (abstract; column; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

a message routing network build on an open platform: (Johnson discloses message routing system that supports communications over numbers of public networks: column 3, lines 27-59).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Johnson's ideas of evaluating routing scripts those defined by numbers of sources (e.g. administration station and customer) to determine desired destination for the call into Owens's system in order to increase flexibility messages routing system (e.g. modifiable routing scripts), see (Johnson: column 2, lines 49-61).

However, Owens-Johnson does not explicitly disclose at least some of the one or more sending services and the one or more recipient service are managed by different organization entities.

In analogous art, stewart discloses collaboration system manages by numbers of business partners, see ([0024]; [0025]; [0027]; [0030]).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine stewart's ideas of using collaboration system which is managed by numbers of business partners to control communications between those business partners into Owens-Johnson's system in order to provide an efficient business information exchange system, see (stewart: [0021]).

*Regarding claim 9:*

Owens-Johnson discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, but does not

explicitly teach including the simple object access protocol (SOAP).

In analogous art, Stewar discloses a system wherein communications can implement over

SOAP: [0338]).

### *Regarding claim 33:*

Owens-Johnson-stewart discloses a method as discuss in claim 32, which includes

delivering said message to said in-transit service for one of data transformation operation, an

enrichment operation, a cross-reference ID mapping operation, a filtering operation, and a credit

scoring operation: (Owens: abstract).

### *Regarding claim 34:*

Owens-Johnson-stewart discloses a method as discuss in claim 32, which includes an in-

transit service is included in routing based on routing script: (Owens: column 2, lines 39-67;

column 7, lines 34-47; column 8, lines 39-42 figure 1; figure 2; figure 3).

### *Regarding claim 50:*

Owens-Johnson-stewart discloses a method as discuss in claim 32, which includes

message is delivered to recipient service after said message has been routed to all in-transit

services in route path: (Owens: column 2, lines 39-67; column 7, lines 34-47; column 8, lines 39-

42 figure 1; figure 2; figure 3).

### *Regarding claim 49:*

Owens-Johnson-stewart discloses a method as discuss in claim 32, which further includes

transport level message service: (stewart: [0061]).

### *Regarding claims 35-36:*

Owens-Johnson-stewart discloses a method as discuss in claim 34, which further includes receiving said message from a party that sends message on behalf of a sender (Owens: abstract).

*Regarding claim 37:*

Owens-Johnson-stewart discloses a method as discuss in claim 34, which includes route path is defined by the in-transit service: (Johnson, abstract; column; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

*Regarding claim 38:*

This claim is rejected under rationale of claim 32.

*Regarding claim 39-42:*

Owens-Johnson-stewart discloses a method as discuss in claim 34, which includes routing is determined recursively, during logical and prior to physical delivery of message: (Johnson: abstract; column; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

*Regarding claims 43-44:*

Owens-Johnson-stewart discloses a method as discuss in claim 34, which includes a routing script defines a procedure based on pattern matching: (Johnson, abstract; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

*Regarding claim 45-47:*

Owens-Johnson-stewart discloses a method as discuss in claim 34, which includes routing scripts based on routing rules: (Johnson: column 5, lines 1-20).

**Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Owens-Johnson-stewart in view of Ghoneimy et al. (US 2004/0078373).**

*Regarding claim 48:*

Owens-Johnson-stewart discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 47, but does not explicitly teach conditions are combined using one or more of an AND, OR, XOR, and NOT operator.

In analogous art, Ghoneimy discloses conditions are using one or more of AND, OR, XOR, and NOT operators ([0091]).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ghoneimy's ideas of using one or more of AND, OR, XOR, and NOT operators into Owens-Johnson-stewart's system in order to save development time and resources by employ well-know technique (e.g. conditions of and, or, xor ....etc) into Owens-Johnson's system.

**Claims 52-56, 58-70 and 72-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Stewart et al. (U.S. 2002/0019797) in view of Owens et al. (U.S. 6,633,630) and further in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. 6,665,393).**

*Regarding claim 52:*

Stewart discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for routing messages from one or more sending services to one or more recipient services across a message interchange network, comprising:

receiving a registration request from a service for inclusion in a message routing network, said service being operative to provide a data operation according to prosperities and permissions associated with said services: (Stewart discloses a message routing mechanism for business collaboration between business participants (e.g. sending and receiving messages between

business participants). In Stewart's system, the business participants are requested to make

registration, and they are assigned participant roles and security policies: abstract, lines 7-14;

figure 20; [0025]; [0027]; [0030]).

said message routing network being built on an open platform overlaying a public

network: (Stewart clearly discloses his system can be an open platform that supports

collaboration communications between business participants: [0024]; [0060]).

including said service in directory of services, said directory of services enabling users of

said message routing network to define at least a portion of a desired data processing on a

message: (Stewart system allows each individual participant to define, implement private

business processes locally: [0006]; [0080]-[0081]).

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose determining a route path for delivery of a

message to one or more recipient services, said route path including one or more in-transit

services.

In analogous art, Owens discloses a universal mailbox or communication server those

serve as an access point for electronic messages communications (e.g. email, voice mail,

fax…etc) between the messages senders and the messages receivers. The electronic messages

may be sent through a third party (e.g. the universal mailbox or communication server), see

(Owens, figure 2; figure 3; column 15-47;column 2, lines 39-67; column 7, lines 34-47; column

8, lines 39-42 figure 1; figure 2; figure 3).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Owens's ideas of sending and receiving a messages accordance

with preferences of sender and recipients into Stewart's system in order to provide flexibilities

and convenient for communication system users, see (Owens: column 2, lines 9-19).

However, Stewart- Owens does not explicitly disclose determining based on an

evaluation of two or more routing scripts selected from the group consisting of: routing script

defined by a sending  service, a routing script defined by a recipient service, and one or more

routing scripts defined by one or more in-transit services, such that each service is capable of

independently affecting said determining of said route path during a logical routing of said

message represented by said evaluation.

In analogous art, Johnson discloses method of controlling call routing by executing

routing scripts those are generated by the administration station and cooperated with customer-

generated call routing scripts to determining and addressing desired destination for the call, see

(abstract; column; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Johnson's ideas of evaluating routing scripts those defined by

numbers of sources (e.g. administration station and customer) to determine desired destination

for the call into Stewart- Owens's system in order to increase flexibility messages routing system

(e.g. modifiable routing scripts), see (Johnson: column 2, lines 49-61).

### *Regarding claims 53 and 67:*

In addition to rejection in claims 52 and 64, Stewart-Owens-Johnson further discloses

data transformation service: (Owens, figure 2; figure 3; column 15-47;column 2, lines 39-67;

column 7, lines 34-47; column 8, lines 39-42 figure 1; figure 2; figure 3).

### *Regarding claims 54, 68:*

In addition to rejection in claims 52 and 64, Stewart-Owens-Johnson further discloses enrichment service: (Owens, figure 2; figure 3; column 15-47;column 2, lines 39-67; column 7, lines 34-47; column 8, lines 39-42; figure 1; figure 2; figure 3).

### *Regarding claims 55 and 69:*

In addition to rejection in claims 52 and 64, Stewart-Owens-Johnson further discloses a cross-reference service: (Johnson: abstract; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

### *Regarding claims 58 and 72:*

In addition to rejection in claim 52, Stewart-Owens-Johnson further discloses selecting directory of service by sending service: (Owens, abstracts).

### *Regarding claims 59 and 73:*

In addition to rejection in claims 52 and 64, Stewart-Owens-Johnson further discloses selecting directory of service by recipient service: (Owens, abstracts).

### *Regarding claim 74:*

In addition to rejection in claim 64, Stewart-Owens-Johnson further discloses selecting directory of service by in-transit service: (Johnson: abstract; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

### *Regarding claim 60-62:*

Those claims are rejected under rationale of claim 52.

### *Regarding claim 77:*

In addition to rejection in claim 64, Stewart-Owens-Johnson further discloses routing script maps an invocations of first service to an invocation of second service, wherein contexts of said invocations are managed by said message routing network: (Stewart, 0024]; [0060]).

### *Regarding claim 78:*

In addition to rejection in claim 64, Stewart-Owens-Johnson further discloses script defines a procedure for enabling determination of at least part of a routing message between services: (Johnson, abstract; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

### *Regarding claim 79:*

In addition to rejection in claim 64, Stewart-Owens-Johnson further discloses routing script is defined by one of a sending service, recipient service, and an in-transit service: (Johnson, abstract; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

### *Regarding claims 66, 76:*

Those claims are rejected under rationale of claim 64.

### *Regarding claims 56 and 70:*

In addition to rejection in claims 52 and 64, Stewart-Owens-Johnson further discloses filtering service: (Owens, abstract).

### *Regarding claim 63:*

This claim is rejected under rationale of claim 52.

### *Regarding claim 64:*

Stewart discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a system, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for routing messages from one or more sending services to one or more recipient services across a message interchange network, comprising:

a message routing network having an interface that enables a plurality of services to post messages and to receive messages from said message routing network: (Stewart discloses a

message routing mechanism including collaboration space that supports for business communications between business participants (e.g. sending and receiving messages between business participants): abstract, lines 7-14; figure 20; [0025]; [0027]; [0030]).

message routing being built on an open platform overlaying a public network: (Stewart clearly discloses his system can be an open platform supports collaboration communications between business participants: [0024]; [0060]).

at least some of the one or more sending service and the one or more recipient services are managed by different organizational entities; wherein each sending service and recipient service is accessible according to prosperities and permissions associated with each of the sending service and recipient services: (in Stewart's system, the business participants are requested to make registrations, and they are assigned participant roles and security policies: abstract, lines 7-14; figure 20; [0025]; [0027]; [0030]).

at least portion of said plurality of services providing a menu of data operations that can be selectively applied to a message traversing said message routing network: (Stewart, [0061]).

However, Stewart does not explicitly disclose routing path defining delivery of a message to one or more recipient services, said route path including one or more in-transit services.

In analogous art, Owens discloses a universal mailbox or communication server those serve as an access point for electronic messages communications (e.g. email, voice mail, fax…etc) between the messages senders and the messages receivers. The electronic messages may be sent through third party (e.g. the universal mailbox/ or communication server), see (Owens, figure 2; figure 3; column 15-47;column 2, lines 39-67; column 7, lines 34-47; column 8, lines 39-42 figure 1; figure 2; figure 3).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Owens's ideas of sending and receiving a messages accordance

with preferences of sender and recipients into Stewart's system in order to provide flexibilities

and convenient for communication system users, see (Owens: column 2, lines 9-19).

However, Stewart- Owens does not explicitly disclose determining based on an

evaluation of two or more routing scripts selected from the group consisting of: routing script

defined by a sending service, a routing script defined by a recipient service, and one or more

routing scripts defined by one or more in-transit services, such that each service is capable of

independently affecting said determining of said route path during a logical routing of said

message represented by said evaluation.

In analogous art, Johnson discloses method of controlling call routing by executing

routing scripts those are generated by the administration station and corporating with customer-

generated call routing scripts to determining/ addressing desired destination for the call, see

(abstract; column; column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 1-27).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Johnson's ideas of evaluating routing scripts those defined by

numbers of sources (e.g. administration station and customer) to determine desired destination

for the call into Stewart- Owens's system in order to increase flexibility messages routing system

(e.g. modifiable routing scripts), see (column 2, lines 49-61).

> ***Regarding claim 75:***

In addition to rejection in claim 64, Stewart-Owens-Johnson further discloses the simple

object access protocol (SOAP): (Stewar discloses communications can be implemented over

SOAP: [0338]).

### *Regarding claim 65:*

Owens-Johnson-stewart discloses a method as discuss in claim 64, which transport level

message service: (stewart: [0061]).

**Claims 57 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over**

**Stewart-Owens-Johnson in view of Heuring (U.S. 6,965,878).**

### *Regarding claim 57 and 71:*

Stewart-Owens-Johnson discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claims 52

and 64, but does not explicitly teach a credit scoring service.

In analogous art, Heuring discloses credit scoring system for business-to-business

transaction:  (abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Heuring's ideas of credit scoring with Stewart-Owens-Johnson's

system in order to provide an efficient business communication network, see (Heuring: column

1, lines 10-15).


Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action.  Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.  See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.  In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


# Conclusions

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAN-DAI Thi TRUONG whose telephone number is (571)272-7959. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday from 8:30am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob A. Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

04/07/2008

/Bunjob  Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152